



**MARYLAND GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL
MEETING SUMMARY
LOWE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ROOM 150
18 DECEMBER 2013**

Attendees:

Tom Liebel – MDGBC
Stephen Gilliss – DGS
Meg Andrews - MDOT
David Costello - MDE
Anja Caldwell – MDGBC
Mimi Wright-MDGBC
Lauren Buckler – DGS
Ellen Robertson - DGS

David St. Jean - MEA
Kristen Ahearn - MEA
Caroline Varney- Alvarado - DHCD
Helen Steward - DNR
Prescott Gaylord - MDGBC
Crystal Heide - DLS

Guests:

Delegate Dan Morhaim
Peter Doo – USGBC MD
Mary Pulcinella - USGBC MD
Sabrina Harder - USGBC MD

- I. Chairman Tom Liebel brought the meeting to order. Introductions of all attendees followed.
- II. Chairman Liebel requested a move to approve the meeting summary from the September meeting. Motion was made and the meeting summary was approved.
- III. Chairman Liebel introduced Delegate Dan Morhaim.
 - A. Del. Morhaim reviewed his history with the General Assembly supporting green legislation for much of his tenure including being instrumental in the creation of the Green Building Council. He is the Chairman of the House sub committee on Government Operations which is under the House Health and Government Operations Committee chaired by Delegate Peter Hammen.. He was a major sponsor of last year's bill to require schools to look at solar for all new major construction. Schools are a great locations for solar. With their limited summer hours and energy usage and usually large flat roofs they can generate a lot of power and make money doing so. He noted that a school in Kentucky is virtually net zero and has made \$100,000 back on energy created. He has also visited Germany and has observed the extensive efforts there to use solar power in a climate not nearly as conducive to solar as ours is.
 - B. Del. Morhaim is here today to ask for the Council's recommendations on how to further the use of solar power and thermal systems. Since rebates and tax incentives have been used and need to be funded he's looking for other not so obvious ways to promote this energy source. Could it be added to building codes for example.
 - C. Tom Liebel noted that Council member Prescott Gaylord has a company that installs solar systems. Prescott noted that much of his work is in D.C where the energy credit environment is better. In D.C. the energy credits must come from local sources whereas Maryland allows Solar Renewable Energy Certificates (SRECs) to be bought from outside the state. Keeping them local makes them more valuable. Del. Morhaim asked who controls them. Tom Liebel

said there is a portfolio requirement for a certain percentage to be produced in Maryland. The cost of a Maryland SREC is \$140 while in D.C. a SREC is worth \$480. Prescott also noted that Maryland and DC also sell thermal (not photovoltaic) SRECs. The utilities buy the energy or the SRECs from producers. Energy can be sold by the kilowatt to the utilities while an SREC equals a megawatt. *(Editors note – since the meeting it has been learned that as of February of 2012 the PSC has made it a requirement that SRECs be purchased from in-state sources only. Apparently this has not been enough to drive up the cost of SRECs in Maryland.)*

D. Mimi Wright asked if the schools then can sell both energy and SRECs. Lauren Buckler noted that the State government doesn't sell all of its SRECs as it has to hold on to some of them to show an energy use reduction by the state. Prescott said its not useful to schools as schools don't have access to the ITC Companies that install solar panels can sell the credits and get a tax depreciation on the panels themselves. Solar developers have figured out how to take advantage of the system so that their companies can install panels for free and sell the SRECs. Three quarters of Prescott's solar installations are in DC due to this.

E. Tom Liebel asked if MEA has a solar clearinghouse that the consumer can use. David St. Jean is not aware of such thing. David noted there are some local permitting issues from county to county resulting in expensive permits. Prescott added that solar is new enough that local inspectors don't always understand the systems. They also run into issues at historic buildings due to the aesthetic of solar panels. Del. Morhaim asked if the permitting issue is simply a matter of education for the officials. Prescott said that education would help. There is not actually much in the codes concerning solar installations so the local code officials can basically require things that aren't supported by code.

F. Tom Liebel noted that some historic building issues can be worked around with materials such as solar shingles or by placing the panels at the building's secondary view i.e., not the front roof surface. Tom also noted that fire marshals have issues with leaving enough open roof surface for ventilating roofs in fires and also with potential electrocution issues. Prescott noted that codes already require a visible fireman shut off switch.

G. Anja noted that her parents are here from Germany and noted how much light we use here. Germans pay 3 times as much for electricity per kw so there is much more conservation. While renewable electricity use is a positive thing it should not be used to offset overuse of energy. Conservation is more important. It is easier to save 15% at a school through conservation than it is to produce 2% in solar energy. Any subsidies to promote solar energy should be somehow tied to conservation. If solar subsidizes waste its not effective. Dan Morhaim agreed and worked to get energy savings in new schools but by the time that law was passed a lot of new schools had been built.

H. Tom Liebel noted that we have the ability to prescribe for state owned buildings but not for leasing and procurement. There should be scoring advantages to developers that offer green and solar building.

I. Del. Morhaim asked the Council to prepare a letter with the recommendations we've discussed here today prior to the start of session.

J. Kristen Ahearn of MEA asked if there is an energy carve out for solar of 2%. David Costello said there is a carve out but the benefits dissipate after 2016.

K. Prescott said he also does near net zeroes that can get to 80% efficiency. The incentives are in the wrong place. If the purpose is for less energy use, then energy efficiency or conservation is more important. Dan Morhaim said there should be market logic in efficiency. In writing its recommendations, the Council should not feel constrained to only push solar. He is open to all ideas.

L. Mimi Wright likes geothermal systems. She gets free hot water as the system's reject heat is used to heat water. She also likes that it can reduce energy consumption in the summer when we often need it most in this climate. Prescott said there are other systems that do this as well taking heat from the house to heat water.

M. Anja said that user education is important. Even leaving on an LED light uses energy. Anja again mentioned the incandescent candelabra bulbs. Lauren Buckler replied that the buy American mandate prevented the purchase of candelabra bulbs.

N. Dan Morhaim again asked for recommendations. Some may be easy, some may be harder. Some may be costlier. But shouldn't we prefer to build 100 good buildings or 98 great ones? We can start the process toward efficiency. Some laws will pass and some won't.

IV. The next topic on the agenda was presented by Meg Andrews of MDOT.

A. In 2011 the legislature and Governor passed incentives for electric vehicles and infrastructure. The Maryland Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council (EVIC) was created. The Council would like to add a requirement to the Maryland Building Performance Standards (MBPS) to require a certain percentage of parking at commercial and multi-family housing to be Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) ready. (conduit and panels prepared for the addition of EVSEs).

B. The goal is to have 60,000 EVs in the state by 2020. There are currently 440 public EVSEs in Maryland. Since a lot of charging will occur at home, people living in apartments and other multi family housing don't have access to the infrastructure to charge their vehicles. Many apartment complex owners are reluctant to install the EVSEs in their parking lots and garages. The Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council is going to propose legislation requiring EV ready spaces. Several members of the General Assembly are on the EVIC and will sponsor legislation.

C. New York has a new 20% requirement. Palo Alto California is considering requiring all new houses to be EV ready. California has done the most so far.

D. Tom Liebel asked if there is a plan to pay for the public electricity. Meg said that commercial places charge around \$2.00 an hour to charge. State installed EVSEs were free through 2013. Now they can be changed to charge money. MDOT has 32 EVSEs and MEA is providing a grant to install more at transit locations.

E. Tom said it appears to be a good idea to make EV ready spaces versus the cost of retrofitting. Meg said that standard convenience outlets in public garages just don't have the capacity for a rapid charge. Level 2 charges at 240 volts, similar to your clothes dryer outlet, is what is recommended. David St Jean asked what part of the code would cover this as outside parking is usually a zoning requirement.

F. Caroline Varney Alvarado said that codes are under DHCD. The International Energy Conservation Code is required in all jurisdictions in the state and can only be altered locally if it is made more stringent. This change would have to be placed in the right code so that locals cannot edit it out. The EVIC should be aware of this. She will discuss with the DHCD energy group which deals with energy efficiency in housing.

G. Tom Liebel said it shouldn't be that complicated if required by code. The Council will be supportive. Meg said the legislation hasn't been drafted yet but it will be done in cooperation with DHCD codes. Prescott Gaylord was trying to think if there is a downside. Perhaps the requirement would be different for urban versus rural locations. Tom is in favor in general. The Council can look at the specific language when the bill is written. Meg said the decision was just made in December. Tom responded that the Council will support the concept at this time and can provide a letter of support once legislation is written.

V. The Council moved on to the discussing the review of the first draft of the Maryland Green Building Council supplement to the IgCC.

A. Stephen Gilliss said this first draft was sent out to members yesterday. All sections need to be reviewed. Some of the directions were not as clear when getting down to making the changes. Chapter 4 was especially sketchy so there are a number of comments in red. It probably makes sense for a lot of this section to direct users to MDE regs for storm water and erosion control as Maryland's is some of the best in the country.

B. Caroline Varney Alvarado was concerned with how the supplement is written and how it works with the code. Stephen said that he followed the Washington D.C supplement as a model

but that ours is much simpler. It is also consistent with other code supplements. Caroline said she will still need to review it with DHCD attorneys.

C. The homework assignment is for members to review against the actual code for consistency, accuracy and intent. Any comments can be sent prior to the next meeting. The more that can be corrected now, the better the next draft for the next meeting will be.

- VI. Stephen Gilliss asked for a recap of the issues and assignments to prepare the letter of recommendations to Del. Morhaim.
- A. David St. Jean can look into the current state of SRECs in Maryland.
 - B. Investigate Fire Marshal concerns re: solar panels and consider how to establish a uniform code across the state for solar panel installation. That would include an education component for code officials.
 - C. Brainstorm other ways to promote solar. Does MEA have any current promotions for solar.
 - D. Mimi Wright thought that if the SRECs price could be increased the utilities themselves might promote it.
 - E. David St. Jean asked which codes cover solar panels. Prescott said he could look into that. Caroline said the Fire Marshal uses life safety codes but can require almost anything as they have their own code.
 - F. Anja reiterated that any recommendations should include Conservation and Education.

- VII. Tom recognized 3 members of USGBC MD in the gallery and asked if they were there for a specific issue given this is the last meeting prior to session. They responded that they were not there for anything specific but have decided someone from USGBC MD will attend all meetings so as to keep up with our activities.

- VIII. Tom opened up the floor for “Once Around the Table”.
- A. Lauren Buckler noted that the 16 agency energy competition will take place on February 6. The “Energy Cup” will be awarded at the event and the Governor is expected to be in attendance.
 - B. Tom said the sustainable communities tax credit is up for renewal this legislative session. Hopefully it will be authorized and include a LEED Gold incentive
 - C. Meg Andrews said that MDOT is working on its own code based on the IgCC. It is similar but has exceptions and applications for MDOT’s specific different building types. Tom asked her to share it with us when a draft is prepared.
 - D. Mimi wanted to compliment SHA for some shoreline erosion control work they are doing.
 - E. Prescott Gaylord asked if the Council wants to take up QAB sustainability credits....Tom said yes.

- IX. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00PM. The next meeting location is scheduled for January 22, 2014 at 10 AM in Room 150 of the Lowe House Office Building. **(Note: the January meeting of the Council was canceled)**

The preceding is intended as a summary only of the discussions held on this meeting date. Council members are requested to review the summary and notify the writer of any errors, omissions or unintended misrepresentations of the discussion.